

Rigidity for dicritical germ of foliation in $\mathbb{C}^2$.

February 2, 2008

Abstract

We study some kind of rigidity property for dicritical foliation in $\mathbb{C}^2$ thanks to a new meromorphic function associated to any dicritical foliation playing the role of equation of separatrix. To be more specific, we compute infinitesimal obstructions for realizing the holonomy pseudo-group of a dicritical foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on any source manifold of a blowing-up morphism with same dual tree as the desingularization of $\mathcal{F}$. Using two examples, we remark that these obstructions come from some analytical invariants shared by *the space of leaves* and the ambient space. This situation never occurs in the non-dicritical case.

Introduction and main statements

Considering the problem of moduli for a germ of singular holomorphic foliation $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ leads naturally to point out some topological and analytical invariants. The invariants of first kind come from the reduction of singularities $E : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ of the foliation: a combinatorial invariant given by the topological class of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and an analytical one given by the analytical class of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$, called the resolution space of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. The invariants of second kind are more related to the foliation itself: the collection of projective holonomy representations defined over each component of the divisor $\mathcal{D}$ and Dulac applications, in other words *the holonomy pseudo-group*. A natural problem is to know whether *coherent* data of above invariants correspond to a concrete foliation.

A germ of formal foliation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ is the data of a formal germ of 1-form at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$

$$\omega = a(x, y)dx + b(x, y)dy \quad (1)$$

up to a unity and a conjugacy with $a, b \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. When ω is convergent, $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is said to be convergent and will be denoted simply by $\mathcal{F}$. A *formal separatrix* of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is a formal irreducible curve $\{f = 0\}$ given by a formal germ of reduced function f such that f divides $df \wedge \omega$ in $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is convergent, a separatrix is nothing but a germ of analytical curve which is a formal separatrix of $\mathcal{F}$ seen as a formal foliation. In [2], C. Camacho and P. Sad proved that any singular germ of foliation in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ admits at least one separatrix. A foliation is said *dicritical* when it has not a infinite number of separatrix.

Let us denote by $E : (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ the reduction process ([10][8]) of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ where $\mathcal{D}$ refers to the exceptional divisor $E^{-1}(0)$. The singularities of $E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ are *reduced*, which means that, in some local coordinates, they belong to the following list

1. $\lambda x dy + y dx + \dots$ terms of higher order, $\lambda \notin \mathbb{Q}^-$,
2. $x dy + \dots$ terms of higher order.

In the second case, the singularity is called *saddle-node*. The formal normal forms for such singularity are given in [9]: there exist some coordinates so that the singularity is given by the following 1-form

$$(\zeta x^p - p)y dx + x^{p+1} dy, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}^*, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}.$$

The invariant curve $\{x = 0\}$ is called the *strong invariant curve* and $\{y = 0\}$ the *weak one*. If the germ of the divisor $\mathcal{D}$ is the weak invariant curve, then the singularity is called *tangent saddle-node*. We recall that $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be of *second kind* when $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is non-dicritical and when none singularity of $E^*\mathcal{F}$ is a tangent saddle-node. One have same definition in the convergent context with obvious transposition.

In this article, we study the extended notion of *foliation of second kind*. The definition is the same as *foliation of second kind* defined in [7] but, of course, we do not require the foliation to be non-dicritical. The construction of a *balanced equation* of the separatrix allows us to study this class of foliations. In the non-dicritical case, the balanced equation coincide with an equation of the finite number of separatrix and we prove a criterion for a foliation to be of second kind, which is a standard criterion in the non-dicritical case [7].

Let us define $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{F}=0}$ the sheaf of base $\mathcal{D}$ whose fibre is the space of germs of vector field tangent to the total transform of the zero of a balanced equation $\widehat{F}$. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}}$ be the sub-sheaf of vector field tangent to the foliation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. The sheaf $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty}$ refers to the germs of functions vanishing along the pole of $\widehat{F}$. The first

Theorem. *Let $\widehat{F}$ be a balanced equation. The following properties are equivalent:*

1. $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is of second kind.
2. $\nu_0(\widehat{F}) = \nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$.
3. The sequence of sheaves

$$0 \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{F}=0} \xrightarrow{E^* \frac{\omega}{\widehat{F}}(\cdot)} \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

Thanks to the above result, we compute the infinitesimal obstructions for the following *problem of existence*:

can any deformation of the resolution space of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ be followed by an isoholonomical deformation of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$?

This question is the local version of an harder problem: can any manifold topologically equivalent to the resolution space of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ carry a foliation with same holonomy groupoid as $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. In the second part of this article, we will give a precise statement for this kind of problem. Finally, we are able to prove the following result:

Theorem. *For a generic dicritical formal foliation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, there exists an analytical topologically trivial deformation of the space of resolution of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, which cannot carry any isoholonomical deformation of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$.*

1 Multiplicity of a formal dicritical foliation.

Our first aim is to establish a formula, which links the multiplicity of $\nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})$ and some invariants produced by the desingularization of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$.

The valence $v(D)$ of an irreducible component D of $\mathcal{D}$ is the number of irreducible components of $\mathcal{D}$, which intersect D . In the same way, the integer $v_d(D)$ refers to the *non-dicritical valence*, which means the number of non-dicritical components, which intersect D . Let us denote by $\mathfrak{I}_D$ the sheaf over $\mathcal{D}$ of germs of holomorphic functions, which vanish along the component D of $\mathcal{D}$. Let us denote by $\mathfrak{M}$ the sheaf over $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{O}$ -module generated by the functions E^*h with $h \in \mathcal{O}_2$ and $h(0) = 0$. By induction on the number of blowing-up in E , one can prove that there exist numbers $\nu(D)$, called the *multiplicity of D* such that, one has the following decomposition

$$\mathfrak{M} = \prod_{D \in \text{Comp}(\mathcal{D})} \mathfrak{I}_D^{\nu(D)}.$$

The integer $\nu(D)$ is also the multiplicity of a curve whose strict transform is smooth and attached to a regular point of D .

Let us consider the following definition introduced by C. Hertling in [4].

Definition 1.1. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ be a germ of formal foliation given by a 1-form*

$$\omega = a(x, y)dx + b(x, y)dy$$

1. *Let $(\widehat{S}, p)$ a germ of smooth formal invariant curve. If, in some coordinates, $\widehat{S}$ is the curve $\{y = 0\}$ and p the point $(0, 0)$, then the integer $\text{ord}_0 b(x, 0)$ is called the *indice of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ at p with the respect of $\widehat{S}$* and is denoted by $\text{Ind}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{S}, 0)$.*
2. *Let $(\widehat{S}, p)$ a germ of smooth formal non-invariant curve. If, in some coordinates, $\widehat{S}$ is the curve $\{y = 0\}$ and p the point $(0, 0)$, then the integer $\text{ord}_0 a(x, 0)$ is called the *tangency order of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ with the respect of $\widehat{S}$* and is denoted $\text{Tan}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, \widehat{S}, p)$.*

In [4], one can find the following formula, which is an extension of [1] when there are dicritical components:

Proposition 1.1 ([4]). *The multiplicity of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ satisfies the equality*

$$\nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 = \sum_{D \in \text{Comp}(d)} \nu(D) \rho(D)$$

where

1. if D is non-dicritical, $\rho(D) = -v_{\bar{d}}(D) + \sum_{q \in D} \text{Ind}(E^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, q)$.
2. if D is dicritical, $\rho(D) = 2 - v_{\bar{d}}(D) + \sum_{q \in D} \text{Tan}(E^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, q)$.

One has to notice that this formula is true even if the application E is not the exactly the reduction of singularities but any morphisms build over E by a succession of elementary blowing-up.

We are going to define a notion of *balanced equation* of separatrix of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. A separatrix of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is said to be *isolated* if its stricted transform with the respect of E is attached to a non-dicritical component. When D is dicritical, one call *pencil of D* the set of invariant curves, which strict transform is attached to D .

Definition 1.2. *A complete system of separatrix is the union of two germs of curve $Z \cup P$ where*

1. Z is the union of isolated separatrix and, for any dicritical component D with valence smaller than 2, $2 - v(D)$ curves of the pencil of D .
2. P is the union of $v(D) - 2$ curves of the pencil of any dicritical component D with valence bigger then 3.

A *balanced equation of separatrix* is a germ of meromorphic function whose zeros and poles are the blown down at the origin of $\mathbb{C}^2$ of respectively the sets Z and P .

Let us denote by $\mathcal{SNT}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})$ the set of singularity of $E^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, which are tangent saddle-node. Let $\widehat{F}$ be any balanced equation.

Proposition 1.2. *We have the following equality*

$$\nu_0(\widehat{F}) = \nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{SNT}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})} \sum_{D \in V(s)} \nu(D) \left(\text{Ind}(E^* \widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, s) - 1 \right)$$

where $V(s)$ refers to the set of irreducible components containing the point s . In particular, the multiplicity of $\widehat{F}$ does not depend on the choice of $\widehat{F}$.

Proof: Let us write $\widehat{F} = \frac{\widehat{N}}{\widehat{P}}$ where $\widehat{N}$ and $\widehat{P}$ are holomorphic. The foliations $d\widehat{N}$ and $d\widehat{P}$ are desingularized by the morphism E . By applying

(1.1) to $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, $d\widehat{N}$ and $d\widehat{P}$, we get the next relations:

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 &= \sum_{D \in \text{Comp}(d)} \nu(D)\rho(D), \\ \nu_0(d\widehat{N}) + 1 &= \sum_{D \in \text{Comp}(d)} \nu_{\widehat{N}}(D)\rho_{\widehat{N}}(D), \\ \nu_0(d\widehat{P}) + 1 &= \sum_{D \in \text{Comp}(d)} \nu_{\widehat{P}}(D)\rho_{\widehat{P}}(D).\end{aligned}$$

As components multiplicity depend only on E , we have for any component D

$$\nu(D) = \nu_{\widehat{N}}(D) = \nu_{\widehat{P}}(D).$$

Now, if D is non-dicritical for $\mathcal{F}$, we find

$$\rho(D) = \text{Iso}(D) + \sum_{q \in D \cap \text{SNT}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})} (\text{Ind}(E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, q) - 1),$$

where $\text{Iso}(D)$ is the number of isolated separatrix attached to D . If D is dicritical, $\rho(D)$ is equal to $2 - v(D)$. By definition, if D is non-dicritical, the numbers $\rho_{\widehat{N}}(D)$ and $\text{Iso}(D)$ are equal. Moreover, if D is dicritical with valence smaller than 2, $\rho_{\widehat{N}}(D)$ is equal to $2 - v(D) = \rho(D)$. On any other component, the foliation $\{d\widehat{N} = 0\}$ doesn't have any isolated separatrix and the integer $\rho_{\widehat{N}}(D)$ vanishes. Hence, we have the relation

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_0(\widehat{N}) = \nu_0(d\widehat{N}) + 1 &= \\ &\sum_{\substack{D \in \text{Comp}(d) \\ D \text{ non-dicritical or} \\ D \text{ dicritical and } v(D) \leq 2}} \nu(D)\rho(D) + \\ &\sum_{\substack{D \in \text{Comp}(d) \\ D \text{ non-dicritique}}} \nu(D) \sum_{q \in D \cap \text{SNT}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})} (\text{Ind}(E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, q) - 1). \quad (2)\end{aligned}$$

As $E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is reduced, any point q in a dicritical component verifies the relation

$$\text{Tan}(E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}, D, q) = 0.$$

Hence, for any dicritical components with valence greater than 3, we have $\rho_{\widehat{P}}(D) = -\rho(D)$. In any other case, the integer $\rho_{\widehat{P}}(D)$ is zero. Therefore, we have

$$\nu_0(\widehat{P}) = \nu_0(d\widehat{P}) + 1 = - \sum_{\substack{D \in \text{Comp}(d) \\ D \text{ dicritical and } v(D) \geq 3}} \nu(D)\rho(D). \quad (3)$$

The proposition is the combination of relations (2) and (3).

□

1.1 Dicritical foliation of second kind

The notion of balanced equation comes naturally with a notion of dicritical foliation of second kind. Known properties of second kind class will have analogues in our context.

Definition 1.3. $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is said to be of second kind when none singularity of $E^*\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is a tangent saddle-node. When $\mathcal{F}$ is convergent, $\mathcal{F}$ is said to be of second kind when it is as formal foliation.

Of course, we do not require here $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ to be non-dicritical. The following corollary of (1.2), which shows how these foliations naturally generalized the class of non-dicritical foliation of second kind:

Proposition 1.3. Let $\widehat{F}$ be a balanced equation. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is of second kind if and only if $\nu_0(\widehat{F}) = \nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$

This property is a clear analogue of a property for non-dicritical foliation of second kind established in [9].

2 Analysis of dicritical obstructions.

In [3], we prove the following result, which can be summary by saying that analytical invariants of the holonomy pseudo-group and analytical invariants of the ambient space are disconnected.

Theorem 2.1 ([3]). Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be a singular formal **non-dicritical** foliation of second kind at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $E_0 : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ its desingularization. For any blowing-up process E_1 topologically equivalent to E_0 , there exists a foliation $\mathcal{F}_1$ at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$ linked to $\mathcal{F}_0$ by an isoholonomical deformation such that the desingularization of $\mathcal{F}_1$ is exactly E_1 .

For a precise definition of *isoholonomical deformation*, we refer to [6]; but basically, these are topologically trivial deformations along which the holonomy pseudo-group is constant. The main tool for the proof of the above theorem is the equivalent result at the infinitesimal level, which is a trivial consequence of the existence of the following exact sequence of sheaves

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow 0. \quad (4)$$

Here, all the sheaves have $\mathcal{D}$ for base. The fibre of $\mathcal{X}$ is the space of vector fields tangent to the total transform by E of the separatrix of $\mathcal{F}$ at the origin of $\mathbb{C}^2$. The sheaf $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the sub-sheaf of $\mathcal{X}$ whose fibre is the space of vector field tangent to the foliation $E^*\mathcal{F}$. These two sheaves correspond respectively to the modular space $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ of infinitesimal deformation of the ambient space and to the modular space $H^1(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}})$ of infinitesimal isoholonomical deformation [6]. Finally, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}}$ refers to the restriction at $\mathcal{D}$ of the structural sheaf of $\mathcal{M}$. Since the first cohomology group of $\mathcal{O}_M M$ is trivial, one has the following sequence

$$H^1(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{F}}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow 0$$

which is the starting point of the proof of (2.1).

2.1 Infinitesimal obstructions.

In this section, we establish a equivalent of the sequence (4) in order to compute the formal infinitesimal obstructions, which prevent the theorem (2.1) from being true for dicritical foliations.

Proposition 2.1. *The following propositions are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{F}$ is second kind.
2. The sequence of sheaves

$$0 \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}} \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{F}=0} \xrightarrow{E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}}(\cdot)} \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

First, we show that the order of multiplicity of the blown-up balanced equation along any irreducible component of the divisor behave well with respect to the multiplicity of the foliation.

Lemme 2.2. *For any component D , we have the following alternative:*

1. if D is non-dicritical, $\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$,
2. if D is dicritical, $\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})$,

where $\nu_D(*)$ refers to the multiplicity of the blown-up in a generic point of D .

Proof: The proof is an induction on the height of the component D in the blowing-up process. At height 1, one can see that: the integers $\nu_{D_0}(F)$ and $\nu_0(F)$ are equal; if D_0 is non-dicritical, $\nu_{D_0}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) = \nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})$ else $\nu_{D_0}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) = \nu_0(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$. Hence, the lemma is the proposition (). For the induction, we look at the blowing-up process at height i and consider a component D of $\mathcal{D}^{i+1}$ obtained by blowing-up of $c \in \mathcal{D}^i$. Let $\widehat{F}^i$ by the divided blown-up of $\widehat{F}$ by E^{*i} . We have the following relations:

$$\nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) = \nu_c(E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + \sum_{D_c \in V(c)} \nu_{D_c}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + \epsilon(D), \quad (5)$$

$$\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_c(\widehat{F}^i) + \sum_{D_c \in V(c)} \nu_{D_c}(\widehat{F}), \quad (6)$$

where $\epsilon(D)$ is 0 when D is non-dicritical, 1 else. From now on, one has to look at each different cases. We recall that $V(s)$ refers to the set of irreducible components of $\mathcal{D}$ that contain s .

1. $V(c)$ consists of one component D_0 .

- (a) D_0 is non-dicritical: let $\widehat{F}_c$ the germ of meromorphic function near the point c product of $\widehat{F}^i$ and of a germ of equation of D_0 . By definition, $\widehat{F}_c$ is a balanced equation for $E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. In view of (), we have

$$\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c) = \nu_c(E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1. \quad (7)$$

Now, the above construction ensures the equality

$$\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c) = 1 + \nu_c(\widehat{F}_c^i). \quad (8)$$

Moreover, the induction hypothesis shows the relation

$$\nu_{D_0}(\widehat{F}) = \nu_{D_0}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1. \quad (9)$$

The association of (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) gives the checked result for D .

$$\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 - \epsilon(D).$$

- (b) D_0 **is dicritical**: in that case, one has to choose for $\widehat{F}_c$ the germ $\widehat{F}_c^i$. Once again, $\widehat{F}_c$ is a balanced equation for $E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$. Hence, $\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c)$ is equal to $\nu_c(E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$. Therefore, one gets the relation $\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c) = \nu_c(\widehat{F}_c^i)$. Under the induction hypothesis, $\nu_{D_0}(\widehat{F})$ and $\nu_{D_0}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}})$ are equal. The association of previous relation ensures the equality

$$\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 - \epsilon(D),$$

D_0 being dicritical, $\epsilon(D)$ vanishes.

2. $V(c)$ **consists of two components D_0 and D_1** .

- (a) D_0 **and D_1 are non-dicritical**: let $\widehat{F}_c$ the product of $\widehat{F}^i$ and of a germ of equation for $D_0 \cup D_1$. Since the function $\widehat{F}_c$ is a balanced equation for $E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$, $\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c)$ is equal to $\nu_c(E^{i*}\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$. Now, in view of our construction, we have the equality $\nu_c(\widehat{F}_c) = 2 + \nu_c(\widehat{F}_c^i)$. Now, for any $D_c \in V(c)$, $\nu_{D_c}(\widehat{F}) = \nu_{D_c}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1$. These equalities ensures that

$$\nu_D(\widehat{F}) = \nu_D(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}) + 1 - \epsilon(D).$$

- (b) D_0 **is dicritical and D_1 is non-dicritical**: this case can be treated in the same way.

□

Proof: (2.1) Let us suppose $\mathcal{F}$ of second kind and let c be any point of $\mathcal{D}$. The kernel of $E^*\frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}}(\cdot)$ clearly intersects $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ along the sheaf $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}}$. Now, we compute the co-kernel over c . In each following case, we give a local expression of $E^*\frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}}$ in adapted coordinates. The existence of such coordinates is proved in [9] and uses the second kind hypothesis. We give also a solution X in $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{\widehat{F}=0}$ of the equation $E^*\frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}}(X) = g$ for g in $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty}$:

1. c is a regular point of a non-dicritical component, which is neither a zero nor a pole of $\widehat{F}$:

$$E^*\frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}} = \frac{u}{x}dx, \quad X = \frac{g}{u}x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \quad \left(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty}\right)_c = \mathcal{O}_c.$$

2. c is a regular point of a dicritical component, which is neither a zero nor a pole of $\widehat{F}$:

$$E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}} = u dy, \quad X = \frac{g}{u} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad \left(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \right)_c = \mathcal{O}_c.$$

3. c is a singular point of the divisor:

$$E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}} = \frac{u}{x^{\epsilon(D_0)} y^{\epsilon(D_1)}} dx, \quad X = \frac{g x^{\epsilon(D_0)} y^{\epsilon(D_1)}}{u} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad \left(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \right)_c = \mathcal{O}_c.$$

4. c is a zero of $\widehat{F}$:

$$E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}} = \frac{u}{y} dy, \quad X = \frac{g}{u} y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad \left(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \right)_c = \mathcal{O}_c.$$

5. c is a pole of $\widehat{F}$:

$$E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}} = u y dy, \quad X = \frac{g}{u y} \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \quad \left(\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty} \right)_c = (y).$$

Hence, in any case, the morphism $E^* \frac{\widehat{\omega}}{\widehat{F}}(\cdot)$ is onto the sheaf $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty}$, which ensures the exactness of the sequence.

□

Corollary 2.1. *The space of formal infinitesimal obstructions to the problem $(\mathcal{P})$ is $H^1(\mathcal{D}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty})$. This is a $\mathbb{C}$ -space of finite dimension. This dimension is a topological invariant.*

In order to prove the above corollary, let us first consider P a germ of curve in $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{J}}_P$ the subsheaf of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}}$ of functions vanishing along the strict transform of P by E . The map E is a composition $E = E_0 \circ \cdots \circ E_N$ where E_i is the standard blowing-up of one point. For any point c in a divisor $(E_0 \circ \cdots \circ E_j)^{-1}(0)$, $0 \leq j \leq N$, $\nu_c(P)$ refers to the multiplicity at c of the strict transform of P with respect to $E_0 \circ \cdots \circ E_j$.

Lemme 2.3.

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^1(\mathcal{D}, \widehat{\mathcal{J}}_P) = \sum_c \frac{\nu_c(P)(\nu_c(P) - 1)}{2}$$

Proof: The proof is an induction on the length of the blowing-up process. Let E_0 be the blowing-up of the origin. Let us consider the canonical system of coordinates (x_1, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) in adapted neighborhood of $E_0^{-1}(0)$ such that the change of coordinates is written

$$y_2 = y_1 x_1, \quad x_2 = \frac{1}{y_1}.$$

Let p be a reduced equation of P and p_1 and p_2 defined by

$$E^* p = x_1^{\nu_0(p)} p_1 \quad E^* p = y_2^{\nu_0(p)} p_2.$$

Hence, we can describe the space of global sections

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(V_1, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) &\simeq p_1\mathbb{C}[[x_1, y_1]] \\ H^0(V_1 \cap V_2, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) &\simeq p_1\mathbb{C}[[x_1]]((y_1)) \\ H^0(V_2, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) &\simeq \left\{ y_1^{-\nu_0(p)} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}^2} a_{ij} x_1^j y_1^{j-i} \mid a_{ij} \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

An simple computation shows that the following isomorphism

$$H^0(V_1 \cap V_2, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) / H^0(V_1, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \oplus H^0(V_2, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{\frac{\nu_0(p)(\nu_0(p)-1)}{2}}.$$

We decompose the desingularization morphism $E = E_0 \circ E_1$ where E_0 is the first blowing-up of the origin. Let $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ refer to the intersection of D_0 and the strict transform of P . We denote the components of the exceptional divisor $\mathcal{D}_i = E_1^{-1}(s_i)$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, consider $U_i(\epsilon) = B(s_i, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$ be a disc for any smooth metric on D_0 such that U_i does not meet U_j for $j \neq i$. Let U_0 be the complementary of $\bigcup_{i=1, \dots, 4} \overline{B}(s_i, \epsilon/2)$. Finally, let us denote by $\mathcal{U}_i$ the open set $E_1^{-1}(U_i)$.

The system $\{\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1, \dots, \mathcal{U}_i\}$ provides a covering of the divisor $\mathcal{D}$ and the Mayer-Vietoris sequence for the sheaf $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P$ is written

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{D}, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H^1(\mathcal{U}_i, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{ij} H^1(\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \rightarrow 0.$$

where N is given by

$$\bigoplus_i H^0(\mathcal{U}_i, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{ij} H^0(\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j$ is Stein and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P$ a coherent sheaf, the module $H^1(\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P)$ is trivial. Moreover, the morphism E_1 and the Hartogs argument induce following isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(\mathcal{U}_i, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) &\simeq H^0(U_i, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P), \\ H^0(\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) &\simeq H^0(U_i \cap U_j, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, N is identified with $H^1(D_0, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P)$. All these remarks and an inductive limit on the neighborhood of $\mathcal{D}_i$ provide the next isomorphisms

$$H^1(\mathcal{D}, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \simeq H^1(D_0, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P) \oplus \bigoplus_i H^1(\mathcal{D}_i, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_P).$$

Therefore, the lemma is a straightforward computation from the hypothesis of induction and the formula above.

□

Proof: (2.1) Applying the previous lemma with $P = \{\widehat{F} = \infty\}$, once gets the finite dimension statement. Furthermore, looking at the formula, one can see that this dimension depends only the topology of the morphism of desingularization which is a topological invariant of the foliation [1].

□

2.2 A generic example

Let r and $n \geq 2$ be positive integers and $\mathcal{F}_{n,r_1,\dots,r_n}$ the foliation given by the one form

$$x^{r+2}d\left(\frac{x^{r+2} - \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} q_j x^{r+1-j} y^j}{x^{r+1}}\right).$$

Let us suppose that $Q(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} q_j t^j$ satisfies $Q'(t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (t - t_j)^{r_j}$. In ([5]), M. Klughertz proved that these foliations are topological normal forms for $\mathcal{M}$ -foliation, i.e., foliations regular after one blowing-up such that all its invariant curves are separatrix. To be more specific, any foliation regular after one blowing-up such that all its invariant curves are separatrix and satisfying

- there is n invariant curves tangent to the divisor.
- these n curves are tangent to the divisor with orders $r_1, \dots, r_n$.

is topologically to a foliation $\mathcal{F}_{n,r_1,\dots,r_n}$. The position of the tangency point $t_1, \dots, t_n$ does not have any importance. Since, the dimension of $H^1(\mathcal{D}, \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{\widehat{F}=\infty})$ is a topological invariant, one can compute this dimension for this family of foliations in order to extend the result to any $\mathcal{M}$ -foliation.

By a direct computation, one has $\nu_0(\mathcal{F}_{n,r_1,\dots,r_n}) = r + 1$. The foliation is regular after one blowing and the exceptionnal divisor D_0 is not invariant. There are n integral curves S_i , $i = 1..n$, which are tangent to the divisor. In the canonical coordinates $y = tx, x = x$, the points of tangency are given by $t = t_j$ and the r_j are the respective order of tangency. Hence, the foliation is completely reduced once one has reduced the germ of curves $S_i \cup (D_0)_{t_i}$. Therefore, the foliation has n isolated separatrix, which are the curves S_i if viewed after one blowing. Let us denote by h_i a reduced equation of S_i at the origin. One can see that $\nu_0(h_i) = r_i + 1$. Futhermore, the component D_0 is dicritical with valence n . Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1..n-2}$ be $n - 2$ equations of curves of the pencil of D_0 . By definition, the meromorphic function

$$F = \frac{h_1(x,y)h_2(x,y) \cdots h_n(x,y)}{\alpha_1(x,y)\alpha_2(x,y) \cdots \alpha_{n-2}(x,y)}$$

is a balanced equation for $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, since $\nu_0(\alpha_i) = 1$,

$$\nu_0(F) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_0(h_i) - (n - 2) = \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i + 1) - n + 2 = r + 2$$

Hence,

$$\nu_0(F) = \nu_0(\mathcal{F}_{n,r_1,\dots,r_n}) + 1$$

which was predicted by (1.3). Moreover, in view of (2.1), the space of obstructions is of dimension $\frac{(n-2)(n-3)}{2}$. Hence, for any $\mathcal{M}$ -simple foliation $\mathcal{F}$ topologically equivalent to one $\mathcal{F}_{n,r_1,\dots,r_n}$ with n greater than 4, there exists a deformation of the resolution space, which cannot carry any isoholonomical deformation of $\mathcal{F}$. As already mentioned, this situation never occurs in the non-dicritical case and suggests that the space of leaves and the resolution space share some analytical invariants.

References

- [1] C. Camacho, A. Lins Neto, and P. Sad. Topological invariants and equidesingularization for holomorphic vector fields. *J. Differential Geom.*, 20(1):143–174, 1984.
- [2] C. Camacho and P. Sad. Invariant varieties through singularities of holomorphic vector fields. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 115(3):579–595, 1982.
- [3] Y. Genzmer. Constructions of foliations with prescribed separatrix. *preprint Lab. Emile Picard*, 2006.
- [4] C. Hertling. Formules pour la multiplicité et le nombre de Milnor d’un feuilletage sur $(\mathbb{C}^2, 0)$. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 9(4):655–670, 2000.
- [5] M. Klughertz. Existence d’une intégrale première méromorphe pour des germes de feuilletages à feuilles fermées du plan complexe. *Topology*, 31(2):255–269, 1992.
- [6] J.-F. Mattei. Modules de feuilletages holomorphes singuliers. I. Équisingularité. *Invent. Math.*, 103(2):297–325, 1991.
- [7] J.-F. Mattei. Quasi-homogénéité et équiréductibilité de feuilletages holomorphes en dimension deux. *Astérisque*, (261):xix, 253–276, 2000. Géométrie complexe et systèmes dynamiques (Orsay, 1995).
- [8] J.-F. Mattei and R. Moussu. Holonomie et intégrales premières. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 13(4):469–523, 1980.
- [9] J.-F. Mattei and E. Salem. Modules formels locaux de feuilletages holomorphes. *PrePrint.*, 2004.
- [10] A. Seidenberg. Reduction of singularities of the differential equation $A dy = B dx$. *Amer. J. Math.*, 90:248–269, 1968.